

05-17-05

12W

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Examiner Named

Inventor : Michael C. Kautzky

Appln. No. : 10/668,437

Filed : September 23, 2003

Title : MAGNETIC SENSOR WITH ADJUSTABLE
ELECTRICAL DIMENSIONS

Docket No. : I69.12-0593

Group Art Unit: 2653

Examiner: Davis, David D.

EXPRESS MAIL COVER SHEET

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SENT VIA EXPRESS MAIL

Express Mail No.: EV 485711340 US

The following papers are being transmitted via **EXPRESS MAIL** to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office on the date shown below:

1. Response; and
2. Return Postcard.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.


Date:

5/16/05

By

David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

DRF/PGK:hlw



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named

Inventor : Michael C. Kautzky

Appln. No. : 10/668,437

Filed : September 23, 2003

Title : MAGNETIC SENSOR WITH ADJUSTABLE
ELECTRICAL DIMENSIONS

Docket No. : I69.12-0593

Group Art Unit: 2653

Examiner: David D. Davis

RESPONSE

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SENT VIA EXPRESS MAIL

Express Mail No.: EV 485711340 US

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on April 20, 2005, in which claims 1-26 were indicated to be subject to a restriction requirement. Specifically, the Examiner requires restriction between either Invention I (claims 1-24, drawn to a magnetic sensor, classified in class 360, subclass 324.2) or Invention II (claims 25 and 26, drawn to a method for narrowing an electrical dimension of a magnetic sensor, classified in class 29, subclass 603.1). The applicants hereby elects Invention I (claims 1-24) for examination on the merits.

The Examiner also requires an election of a single disclosed species for prosecution between Species 1 (FIGS. 1a and 1b), Species 2 (FIG. 2a), Species 3 (FIG. 2b), Species 4 (FIG. 2c), Species 5 (FIG. 5a), and Species 6 (FIG. 5b). The Applicants hereby elect Species 1 (FIG. 1a and 1b) for prosecution on the merits. Claims 1-17 and 24 are readable directly on Species 1. Dependent claims 18-21 are readable on Species 2 and 3, and dependent claims 22 and 23 are readable on Species 4. The Applicants believe that Species 1 is actually generic to Species 2-4, since "[t]he MR stacks shown in FIGS. 2a, 2b, and 2c are exemplary architectures for MR stack 12 of FIG. 1a and MR stack 32 of FIG. 1b" (Page 9, lines 20-22). Because Species 1 is generic to Species 2-4, the claims drawn to the various MR

stack configurations in Species 2-4 are encompassed within Species 1 (FIGS. 1a and 1b). Thus, claims 1-24 should be examined as a part of elected Species 1 (FIGS. 1a and 1b).

The Examiner further stated that no claims are currently generic to all species. Applicants believe, however, that claims 1, 2, 8, 11, and 12 are all generic and read on each of the species referred to by the Examiner. Consideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date:

5/16/05

By



David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

DRF/PGK:hlw